

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/627,080	07/25/2003	Joachim Wolf	331.1048	3127
	7590 02/20/2007 DAVIDSON & KAPPEI	EXAMINER		
485 SEVENTH AVENUE, 14TH FLOOR			PICKARD, ALISON K	
NEW YORK, I	NY 10018		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3673	
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MO	NTHS	02/20/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/627,080	WOLF ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Alison K. Pickard	3673			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication or Reply	appears on the cover sheet w	vith the correspondence addr	ess		
WHI( - Exte after - If NO - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RECHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING INSIDE IN THE MAILING IN THE MAI	B DATE OF THIS COMMUN R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a riod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO atute, cause the application to become A	ICATION.  reply be timely filed  NTHS from the mailing date of this community (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on					
/=		his action is non-final.				
3)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
-,	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposit	ion of Claims	, , ,	,			
4)  🂢	Claim(s) <u>1-3,6,9-13 and 15-19</u> is/are pendir	ng in the application.				
.,	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5)□	Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
	☑ Claim(s) <u>1-3,9-13 and 15-19</u> is/are rejected.					
	Claim(s) 6 is/are objected to.					
8)[	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	d/or election requirement.				
Applicat	ion Papers					
9)[]	The specification is objected to by the Exam	iner.				
	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a		by the Examiner.			
	Applicant may not request that any objection to t	the drawing(s) be held in abeya	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corr	rection is required if the drawing	g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR	1.121(d).		
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attache	d Office Action or form PTO	<b>-152.</b> .		
Priority (	under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore  All b) Some * c) None of:		§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).			
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
	2. Certified copies of the priority docume	•				
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the p	•	n received in this National St	age		
• •	application from the International Bur	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,				
* \$	See the attached detailed Office action for a l	list of the certified copies no	: received.			
	·					
Attachmen		<del></del>	0.000.450			
1) L Notic 2) Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date			
3) 🛛 Infon	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) Notice of	Informal Patent Application			
Pape	r No(s)/Mail Date	6) 🔲 Other:	<del></del> ·			

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-3 and 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker in view of Devers.

Baker discloses an axle boot comprising a joint housing 16 having plural radial recesses 16b and a bellows 12. The bellows is made of TPE and has an integral connecting collar 15 including a plurality of indentations projecting radially inward and adapted to recesses 16b (see Fig. 2 and col. 3, lines 62-65). A plurality of compensating pieces 22 is attached to an outer surface of the collar to form a cylindrical outer circumference for a clamp 23. The pieces are all connected and include ring sections (near 22) to connect adjacent pieces. The projecting portion of the pieces has a length corresponding to the recess.

Baker does not disclose ring sections wherein at least one ring section is elastically deformable, that the pieces are made of more than one material, or that the pieces have a web. Devers teaches an axle boot having a joint housing and bellows. Devers teaches a plurality of compensating pieces with the bellows. The pieces are connected as a single piece component having ring sections (near 32), wherein at least one is elastically deformable (see col. 4, line 12), which allows the component to be installed. Devers also teaches the compensating pieces include more than one material (i.e. insert 44 is a harder material than the rest of element 40). The pieces

Application/Control Number: 10/627,080

Art Unit: 3673

are a hollow (air-filled) body having flexible walls/ webs (e.g. Fig. 7). Devers teaches that this compensating component provides a more uniform stiffness and compression, thus providing a more uniform sealing and clamping force. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the compensating component of Baker with the unified component taught by Devers to provide a more uniform sealing and clamping force.

Page 3

- 3. Claims 13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP '464.
- JP '464 discloses a boot comprising a joint housing including an external contour with radial recesses. A bellows has a color with plural indentations (e.g. 26) adapted to the recesses. A clamp 11 or 27 with integrated connecting pieces 28 or 14 is disposed around the collar to form a cylindrical outer surface. It is not clear if the pieces are connected to the collar via a rivet. The examiner takes Official Notice that it is well known to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a rivet as a means to connect two pieces. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a rivet to connect the collar and piece with a rivet.
- 4. Claims 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP '464 as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Devers.

Devers teaches an axle boot having a joint housing and bellows. Devers teaches a plurality of compensating pieces with the bellows. Devers also teaches the compensating pieces include more than one material (i.e. insert 44 is a harder material than the rest of element 40). The pieces are a hollow (air-filled) body having flexible walls/ webs (e.g. Fig. 7). Devers teaches that this compensating component provides a more uniform stiffness and compression,

Art Unit: 3673

thus providing a more uniform sealing and clamping force. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the compensating pieces of JP '464 with the pieces taught by Devers to provide a more uniform sealing and clamping force.

## Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claim 6 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

#### Response to Arguments

The problems with the prior art that Baker addresses relate to the disadvantages of the stiff materials used and to the large diameters the boots need. Baker solves this problem using a different material and by using the clamp on the outer surface of the boot, not between the boot and housing. Thus, Baker does not teach away from using an elastomeric deformable clamp. Applicant argues that Baker requires the collar pieces to be free to move. However, Baker also requires the pieces to be tack welded into place before being secured into place by the outer clamp 27. Once secured, the pieces will be fixed in place. using the elastic one-piece band of Devers will not affect the function of the overall boot of Baker. And, given that the band will be pliable, the pieces will still be able to move to a degree while still providing a uniform sealing and clamping force as taught by Devers. More importantly, it has been held that the use of one-piece construction is obvious. See In re Larson 144 USPQ 347, 348 (CCPA 1965).

Regarding the rejection of claims 13 and 15, the examiner notes that Applicant has not argued that it is well known to use a rivet as a means to connect two pieces. Thus, such is

Art Unit: 3673

considered to be admitted prior art. Applicant does argue that the pieces do not appear to be rivotable or how rivets would be used. The examiner disagrees. Rivets are a common means to secure two elements with respect to one another and would provide fixed placement. It would be obvious to use a rivet with each piece 14 (or 28) to fix it in its proper place with respect to band 11. Attention is also directed to Fukumura '323, which shows an example of a rivet/projection 7 used to secure element 6 to element 1.

Figure 7 of Devers shows a radial web.

#### Conclusion

6. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alison K. Pickard whose telephone number is 571-272-7062. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (10-7:30), with alternate Friday's off.

Art Unit: 3673

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tricia Engle can be reached on 571-272-6660. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Alison K. Pickard Primary Examiner Art Unit 3673